REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to this Amendment, claims 1, 3-13, 15-18, and 20-33 were pending in the application.

Claim 1 is amended to include language of paragraph [0036] describing the work performed by a business object according to some embodiments of the invention.

Claims 8 and 20 are canceled.

New claims 34 and 35 depend from claim 1 and are added to protect features of the invention not shown by the references cited in the application. No new matter is added with support found at least in paragraph [0036].

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, 15-18, and 21-35 remain for consideration by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

In the February 16, 2005 Office Action and the Advisory Action, claims 1, 3-13, 15-18, and 20-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner construed the specification as failing to support the claim 1 limitation of "wherein the business object is responsible for the data validating." The Examiner asserts that step 26 of Applicants' Figure 3 is carried out by the import/export utility and not by the business object. The Examiner further stated on page 2 of the Office Action that he interpreted the claims according to this construction, i.e., the Examiner believes that the cited references show the claimed method if the import/export utility performs the data validating. This rejection is traversed based on the following remarks.

Interview Summary: The Examiner granted a telephone interview on May 19, 2005 to discuss the rejection of claim 1 and possible claim amendments to overcome the rejection based on 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Applicants appreciate the participation of Examiner Diem Cao and Primary Examiner Sue Lao. No agreement was reached as to the proper interpretation of Figure 3 and its supporting text in paragraph [0019] and elsewhere in the specification. However, it was agreed that amending claim 1 to comply with the language of paragraph [0036]

would likely overcome the rejection of claim 1 and the claims that depend from claim 1.

Claim 1 is amended to include language found in paragraph [0036] of the specification including "delivering the data to the business object" and "with the business object, performing a task on the delivered data." Language objected to by the Examiner was deleted to expedite prosecution of the application and not due to a lack of support of the deleted language (as discussed fully in the Amendment mailed April 7, 2005). Applicants believe that after the amendments to claim 1 that claim 1 fully complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph and that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

In the February 16, 2005 Office Action, claims 1, 3-13, 15-18, and 20-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,163,781 ("Wess") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,363,388 ("Sprenger"). The rejection of the claims is traversed based on the following remarks.

The Examiner made his rejection based on the interpretation that the language of claim 1 requiring that the business object be responsible for the data validating was not support by the specification, and as a result, the rejection of claim 1 (and the claims depending on claim 1) was based on Wess and Sprenger together teaching that a utility performed such data validating. Claim 1 is amended to call for delivering data to the business object and then performing a task on the data with the business object. Such use and functionality of a business object are not shown by Wess and Sprenger, and hence, claim 1 and the claims that depend from claim 1 are believed in condition for allowance.

The Response to Arguments of the Final Office Action states that Wess teaches a "data object" and Sprenger teaches a "business object" such that together they teach the limitations of claim 1. Applicants disagree with the construction and interpretation of these references for the reasons previously stated in the prior amendment and as restated in the following paragraphs.

As noted in para. [0003] of the application, the invention is addressing the problems associated with prior E-commerce systems in which a database loader was used to load information but only in the form of tables. With reference to para. [0036], the invention uses an import/export utility that knows nothing of the E-commerce system to deliver information from an external data file to business object that is do the "real work" such as performing tasks including adding, deleting, or updating the data (see, new claim 35). The changes in the data can be performed without requiring the business object to be changed. As shown in Fig. 1, the import/export utility communicates with the business object and gathers the imported file and provides a database that is used during the processing of the import file data by the business object. In this manner, the business object is able to import/export data, such as with relation to an E-commerce system, without use of a standard database loader and, hence, to load data not in the form of a table.

With this background in mind, claim 1 is directed to a method of processing data with a utility including selecting a file that includes a name of a business object, uploading the file to a server, storing file data in a database of the utility, delivering the data to the business object, and performing a task on the data with the business object. The combination of Wess and Sprenger fail to teach or suggest all of these elements. Hence, the rejection of claim 1 is improper and should be withdrawn.

More specifically, the Office Action cites Wess at col. 6, lines 16-29 for teaching selecting a file that includes a name of a business object. Applicants disagree with this construction of Wess. Wess at col. 2, lines 30-40 makes it clear that its method is address problems associated with having a database with many null data values, and beginning at line 6, col. 4 provides a brief summary of its method that uses a table of defined variable symbols and comparing operations to try to reduce the amount of null data values in its relational databases. Hence, Wess is addressing a different problem than Applicants and uses a different technique to address that problem.

In the cited col. 6, lines 16-29, Wess is describing the converting data received at a network interface 112 including "textually-based data objects" into formats expected by the system, but at this citation and elsewhere, Wess fails to teach selecting a file that has a business object name in the file. This named object is then used to perform processing on the data of the file, and Wess fails to suggest that its "data objects" are business objects as defined by Applicants. For at least this reason, claim 1 is allowable over Wess.

Further, the Office Action cites Sprenger at col. 15, lines 25-26 and col. 28, lines 20-42 for teaching invoking a code included in the business object as part of processing the data in the selected and uploaded file. Sprenger does not overcome the deficiencies of Wess discussed above. Also, Sprenger in its Summary and elsewhere makes it clear that its method is a data management method that uses agents and minions (see, Sprenger at col. 8, line 60 and on for a discussion of agents and minions) to perform various data management processes, but no where in Sprenger is it taught to select a file with a name of a business object and then process data in the selected file using code in the named business object. At the cited portions of Sprenger, the use of objects is described but there is no teaching of a utility uploading a file and then using a business object named in the file to process its data. For this additional reason, claim 1 is believed allowable over the combination of Wess and Sprenger.

Further, the prior Office Action in rejecting claim 14 admits that Wess fails to teach the business object being responsible for validating the data in the selected file but cites Sprenger at col. 14, lines 59-65 as providing this teaching. However, at this citation, Sprenger is discussing operation of an "EventLogMinion" which does not perform validation of data, and clearly does not teach that the business object is named in the file providing the data. With this in mind, the combined teaching of these references also fails to teach the new limitations of claim 1 including delivering the data to the business object and then performing a task on the data with the business object that changes the data.

Specifically, Wess fails to teach the use of business objects and at col. 14, lines 59-65, Sprenger states a minion "provides a central point of access for all advisory messages that need to be stored persistently in the database. The "events" in the log are descriptions of some event in time, such as the observed failure of a critical component, or the failure of a job stream to complete. The events stored in the log describe unusual conditions that require the attention of the user..." Applicants could find no suggestion in this citation of Sprenger of either delivering data from to the business object or that a task that changes the data is performed on the data by the business object. For this additional reason, claim 1 is allowable over the combined teaching of Wess and Sprenger.

Claims 3-7, 9-13, 15-18, 21-32, 34, and 35 depend from claim 1 and are believed allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. Further, Applicants could find no support in Sprenger (or Wess) as cited by the Examiner for the rejection of the specific database configuration as called for in claim 12 (and as shown in Figure 2). Claim 34 calls for the business object to perform validation after receiving the data, and this limitation is not shown or suggested by the cited references. Claim 35 calls for the task to be adding, deleting, or updating the delivered data, and such tasks are not shown by Wess or Sprenger. For these additional reasons, claims 12, 34, and 35 are not shown or suggested by Wess and Sprenger.

Independent claim 33 is directed to a method of loading information to a network application and includes steps of operating a utility to invoke a business object associated with a business object name from an import file. In the method of claim 33, the business object performs an operation on data delivered by the utility and the method further includes updating the data in a utility database based on the performance of the operation of the invoked business object. The operating of the utility to invoke the business object and the updating of the data steps are similar to limitations presented in claim 1, and the reasons for allowing claim 1 over the combined teaching of Wess and Sprenger are believed applicable to claim 33.

More specifically, Wess fails to teach receiving a selection of an import file that includes a name of a business object. This named business object is then used to perform processing on the data of the file, and Wess fails to suggest that its "data objects" are business objects as defined by Applicants and the Response to Argument confirms that Wess only teaches data objects (see, fourth paragraph of Response to Arguments). For at least this reason, claim 1 is allowable over Wess.

At page 11, the Final Office Action notes that Wess fails to teach the use of business object as called for in claim 33 but then cites Sprenger for providing the missing teaching. Sprenger does not overcome the deficiencies of Wess discussed above for claim 1. Sprenger in its Summary and elsewhere makes it clear that its method is a data management method that uses agents and minions (see, Sprenger at col. 8, line 60 and on for a discussion of agents and minions) to perform various data management processes, but nowhere in Sprenger is it taught to perform an operation with a business object named in an import file on data updoaded to a database by a utility. At the cited portions of Sprenger, the use of objects is described but there is no teaching of a utility uploading a file and then updating the data based on the performance of the operation by the invoked business object.

For example, the Office Action cites col. 5, lines 1-15 for teaching a business object performing an operation on uploaded data, but at this citation, Sprenger teaches that objects can be instantiated from an access layer by accessing the database and later saved to the database. Sprenger does not teach invoking a business object based on an import file and then, using the invoked business object to perform an operation on data in a utility database. For this additional reason, claim 33 is believed allowable over the combination of Wess and Sprenger.

Conclusions

In view of all of the above, the claims are now believed to be allowable and the case in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

The fee associated with filing an RCE is provided with this submittal. However, any additional fees associated with this submittal may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

June 1, 2005

Kent A. Lembke, No. 44,866
Hogan & Hartson LLP
One Tabor Center
1200 17th Street, Suite 1500
Denver, Colorado 80202
(720) 406-5378 Tel
(720) 406-5301 Fax